



Nicholas J. Ferraro
nick@ferrarovega.com
Lauren N. Vega
lauren@ferrarovega.com

ATTORNEYS AT LAW
3333 Camino del Rio South, Suite 300
San Diego, California 92108

619-693-7727
619-350-6855 fax
ferrarovega.com

August 7, 2026

NOTICE OF LABOR CODE VIOLATIONS
CALIFORNIA LABOR CODE SECTIONS 2698 *et seq.*

VIA CERTIFIED U.S. MAIL

- Electronic Return Receipt -

Resonetics, LLC
26 Whipple St
Nashua, NH 03060

- PAGA Notice & Filing Fee -
Submitted electronically to the Labor and
Workforce Development Agency

Dear LWDA Officer and Company Representatives:

This letter serves as written notice under Labor Code section 2699.3 on behalf of **ROWENA A CLARO** ("Plaintiff(s)") and all other "covered employees" of the following "Defendant(s)":

RESONETICS, LLC

Defendants shall mean and include the foregoing in addition to any other related employer entities, individuals under Labor Code sections 558 and 558.1, and all others who may be later added upon further investigation and discovery as liable employers.

This office serves as legal counsel for Plaintiff. If the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA") does not investigate the facts, allegations, and violations set forth in this notice within the statutorily prescribed 65-day period under Labor Code section 2699.3, Plaintiff intends to commence a civil action against Defendants as a proxy and agent of the State of California under the Private Attorneys General Act ("PAGA"). "PAGA allows an 'aggrieved employee'—a person affected by at least one Labor Code violation committed by an employer—to pursue penalties for all the Labor Code violations committed by that employer." *Huff v. Securitas Security Services USA, Inc.* (2018) 23 Cal.App.5th 745, 751; *Kim v. Reins International California, Inc.* (2020) 9 Cal.5th 73, 79. Plaintiff maintains standing to pursue these claims against Defendants as an aggrieved employee.

Through this notice, Plaintiff requests that Defendants complete an internal investigation and audit of the wage and hour and employment practices at issue and make a good faith effort to correct any violations. Plaintiff attempts to identify the non-compliant policies and practices affecting the aggrieved employees so that the parties may resolve the underlying damages and penalties in judgment or settlement approved by the Superior Court of California under Labor Code section 2699(s). Defendants are notified that any attempt to resolve this case should be conducted in coordination with Plaintiff's counsel to protect the interests of Plaintiff, the aggrieved employees, and the State of California via the LWDA. Plaintiff advises Defendants this letter should be also considered a reasonable attempt at settlement of this matter, subject to an exchange of additional documents and information. *Graham v. Daimler Chrysler Corp.* (2004) 24 Cal.4th 553, 561.

- BACKGROUND -

Defendants employed Plaintiff during the PAGA Period in the position of Operator II from about October 2025 to present. During their employment Plaintiff and the other covered (i.e., aggrieved) employees were subject to the wage and hour and employment protections set forth in the California Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders.

Through this notice, Plaintiff informs the LWDA of the Labor Code violations set forth herein. The “aggrieved employees” include Plaintiff and the following individuals:

All current and former non-exempt employees, including those misclassified as non-exempt, who worked for Defendants in the State of California during one-year period preceding the date of this notice through the current date and the date of trial in any pending action (the “covered employees” and the “PAGA Period”). As defined, these covered current and former employees are “aggrieved employees” under PAGA.

Plaintiff reserves the right to expand or narrow the definition of the “covered employees” in the forthcoming civil action. Furthermore, Plaintiff seeks all recoverable civil penalties for Defendants' violations and reserves the right to supplement this notice as further investigation is completed and further facts, witnesses, and violations are uncovered.

- PAGA CLAIMS -

Unpaid Hours Worked/Minimum Wage Violation of Labor Code §§ 1194, 1197, 1198; IWC Wage Orders

Defendants violated Labor Code sections 1194, 1197, and 1198, along with the California Minimum Wage Order, the applicable local minimum wage ordinances, and the “Hours and Days of Work” and “Minimum Wages” sections of the applicable IWC Wage Orders with respect to the covered employees.

Labor Code section 1194 renders it unlawful for an employee to receive less than the legal minimum wage for hours worked in California. Labor Code section 1197 further mandates that “[t]he minimum wage for employees fixed by the commission is the minimum wage to be paid to employees, and the payment of a lower wage than the minimum so fixed is unlawful.” Labor Code section 1198 renders “employment of any employee for longer hours than those fixed by the order or under conditions of labor prohibited by the [IWC Wage Orders]” unlawful. The California Minimum Wage Order and the applicable sections of the IWC Wage Orders further require payment of minimum wages for all hours worked. The “Minimum Wages” sections of the applicable IWC Wage Order provide that “[e]very employer shall pay to each employee, on the established payday for the period involved, not less than the applicable minimum wage for all hours worked in the payroll period, whether the remuneration is measured by time, piece, commission, or otherwise.” The foregoing California wage laws require payment of “not less than the applicable minimum wage *for all hours worked* in the payroll period” and California law does not allow averaging of pay over the hours worked in the pay period, even if the total pay results in an average above the minimum wage. *Armenta v. Osmose, Inc.* (2005) 135 Cal.App.3d 314, 324.

Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the covered employees at the lawful minimum wage rate for all hours worked, resulting in unpaid minimum wages. Specifically, Defendants required Plaintiff and the covered employees to perform off-the-clock work by completing mandatory onboarding training without pay. In or around October 2025, Plaintiff spent approximately three hours over multiple days completing the training. The training included watching mandatory videos and filling out employment forms, for which Defendants failed to provide any compensation. On information and belief, this was a common practice among the covered employees.

As a result, Plaintiff may recover civil penalties as an individual and on behalf of the State of California and the covered employees, up to the maximum amount allowed as set forth under the Labor Code.

Unpaid Overtime **Violation of Labor Code §§ 510, 1194, 1198; IWC Wage Orders**

Defendants violated Labor Code sections 510, 1194, and 1198, along with the “Hours and Days of Work” sections of the applicable IWC Wage Orders with respect to the covered employees.

Labor Code section 510 requires “[a]ny work in excess of eight hours in one workday and any work in excess of 40 hours in any one workweek and the first eight hours worked on the seventh day of work in any one workweek shall be compensated at the rate of no less than one and one-half times the regular rate of pay for an employee;” and “any work in excess of 12 hours in one day shall be compensated at the rate of no less than twice the regular rate of pay for an employee;” and “any work in excess of eight hours on any seventh day of a workweek shall be compensated at the rate of no less than twice the regular rate of pay of an

employee.” Labor Code section 1194 renders it unlawful for an employee to receive less than the legal overtime rate for overtime hours worked in California. Labor Code section 1198 renders “employment of any employee for longer hours than those fixed by the order or under conditions of labor prohibited by the [IWC Wage Orders]” unlawful. The IWC Wage Orders further require payment of overtime wages for all overtime hours worked, including the “Hours and Days of Work” sections.

Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the covered employees overtime wages and the lawful rate of pay for overtime hours worked, resulting in unpaid overtime wages. Plaintiff and the covered employees were not paid for all overtime hours worked due to Defendants’ unlawful practice of requiring off-the-clock work, as described above, and deducting hours worked, including overtime hours, to cover meal periods. To the detriment of Plaintiff and the covered employees, whenever they accrued overtime, Defendants systematically shaved, or “pulled” those earned overtime hours from their timesheets under the guise of providing paid meal periods, rather than compensating them at their applicable overtime rates. As a result, Defendants failed to properly pay Plaintiff and the covered employees for all compensable overtime. When Plaintiff and the covered employees worked more than 8 hours per day or over 40 hours in a workweek, these unlawful practices directly resulted in unpaid overtime wages.

Additionally, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the covered employees their overtime wages at the lawful regular rate of pay for overtime hours worked, resulting in unpaid overtime wages. Specifically, Plaintiff earned a shift differential for working afternoon shifts. These shift differentials should have been included in the regular rate of pay when calculating overtime premium. However, Defendants failed to include these payments in their calculations, resulting in unpaid overtime wages.

An illustrative example of this violation is shown on Plaintiff’s wage statement below:

<table border="0"> <tr> <td>CO.</td> <td>FILE</td> <td>DEPT.</td> <td>CLOCK</td> <td>VCHR. NO.</td> <td>010</td> </tr> <tr> <td>RZ2</td> <td>102402</td> <td>03000D</td> <td></td> <td>0000080141</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="6">Page 1(Con't Next Page)</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="6">RESONETICS LLC</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="6">26 WHIPPLE ST</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="6">NASHUA, NH 03060</td> </tr> </table>	CO.	FILE	DEPT.	CLOCK	VCHR. NO.	010	RZ2	102402	03000D		0000080141	1	Page 1(Con't Next Page)						RESONETICS LLC						26 WHIPPLE ST						NASHUA, NH 03060						Earnings Statement Period Beginning: 02/01/2026 Period Ending: 02/14/2026 Pay Date: 02/20/2026 ROWENA A CLARO													
CO.	FILE	DEPT.	CLOCK	VCHR. NO.	010																																													
RZ2	102402	03000D		0000080141	1																																													
Page 1(Con't Next Page)																																																		
RESONETICS LLC																																																		
26 WHIPPLE ST																																																		
NASHUA, NH 03060																																																		
Social Security Number: XXX-XX-XXXX																																																		
<table border="0"> <tr> <th>Earnings</th> <th>rate</th> <th>hours</th> <th>this period</th> <th>year to date</th> </tr> <tr> <td>Regular</td> <td>22.0000</td> <td>64.73</td> <td>1,424.06</td> <td>4,810.30</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Overtime</td> <td>33.0000</td> <td>1.48</td> <td>48.84</td> <td>48.84</td> </tr> <tr> <td>California Sick</td> <td>22.0000</td> <td>11.50</td> <td>253.00</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Differential</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>126.97</td> <td>490.29</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Paid Meal</td> <td>22.0000</td> <td>4.00</td> <td>88.00</td> <td>308.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Holiday</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>1,056.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Gross Pay</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>\$1,940.87</td> <td>7,494.43</td> </tr> </table>	Earnings	rate	hours	this period	year to date	Regular	22.0000	64.73	1,424.06	4,810.30	Overtime	33.0000	1.48	48.84	48.84	California Sick	22.0000	11.50	253.00		Differential			126.97	490.29	Paid Meal	22.0000	4.00	88.00	308.00	Holiday				1,056.00	Gross Pay			\$1,940.87	7,494.43	Other Benefits and Information <table border="0"> <tr> <th></th> <th>this period</th> <th>total to date</th> </tr> <tr> <td>G.T.L</td> <td>2.91</td> <td>11.64</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Pto</td> <td>16.34</td> <td></td> </tr> </table>		this period	total to date	G.T.L	2.91	11.64	Pto	16.34	
Earnings	rate	hours	this period	year to date																																														
Regular	22.0000	64.73	1,424.06	4,810.30																																														
Overtime	33.0000	1.48	48.84	48.84																																														
California Sick	22.0000	11.50	253.00																																															
Differential			126.97	490.29																																														
Paid Meal	22.0000	4.00	88.00	308.00																																														
Holiday				1,056.00																																														
Gross Pay			\$1,940.87	7,494.43																																														
	this period	total to date																																																
G.T.L	2.91	11.64																																																
Pto	16.34																																																	

Here, Plaintiff earned a shift differential of \$126.97 in the same pay period Plaintiff worked 1.48 hours of overtime. Defendants should have, but failed to, include the entire payment in the regular rate of pay when calculating the overtime, instead paying overtime at a straight 1.5x of Plaintiff's base rate.

As a result, Plaintiff may recover civil penalties as an individual and on behalf of the State of California and the covered employees, up to the maximum amount allowed as set forth under the Labor Code.

Unpaid Paid Sick Leave **Violation of Labor Code §§ 246 through 248.7**

Defendants violated Labor Code sections 246 through 248.7 with respect to the covered employees.

Labor Code section 246 requires employers to provide paid sick leave to its workforce on the terms set forth in the statute. Employers must comply with the accrual, use, and notice provisions of Labor Code sections 246, 246.5, 247, and must further ensure that they maintain the paid sick leave records required by Labor Code section 247.5. Employers have the option of providing 40 hours of paid sick leave to employees or to allow employees to accrue paid sick leave each pay period. If an employer chooses the accrual method, employees must accrue sick leave at a rate of one hour for every thirty hours worked in a given pay period as set forth in Labor Code section 246(b)(1). Under the accrual method, employees must begin accruing paid sick leave at the commencement of employment.

Employers must pay sick leave in accordance with one of the three permissible methods provided in Labor Code section 246(l): (1) "the same manner as the regular rate of pay for the workweek;" (2) "by dividing the employee's total wages, not including overtime premium pay, by the employee's total hours worked in the full pay periods of the prior 90 days;" or (3) "for exempt employee ... in the same manner as the employer calculates wages for other forms of paid leave time." Labor Code sections 248.6 and 248.7 similarly require paid sick leave to be paid at a regular rate-based calculation in excess of the base hourly rate and at the lawful accrual rate.

Under Labor Code section 246(i), employers must provide employees "with written notice of the amount of paid sick leave available ... for use on either the employee's itemized wage statement ... or in a separate writing provided on the designated pay date with the employee's payment of wages."

Defendants failed to comply with California's paid sick leave laws with respect to the covered employees. Because Defendants failed to record and pay Plaintiff and the covered employees for all hours worked, Defendants also failed to credit them with all the paid sick leave hours they accrued. Additionally, each time Defendants deducted overtime hours worked by Plaintiff and the covered employees, those overtime hours were not accounted for when

calculating their accrued paid sick leave. As a result, Plaintiff and the covered employees did not receive the full amount of accrued paid sick leave that they had earned.

To the extent that Plaintiff and the covered employees earned sick pay in the same period they earned shift differentials, Defendants underpaid those wages due to the regular rate violations addressed above. Specifically, Defendants did not pay Plaintiff and the covered employees sick leave “in the same manner as the regular rate of pay for the workweek in which the employee uses paid sick leave, whether or not the employee actually worked overtime in that workweek,” as the regular rate should have included shift differentials.

As a result, Plaintiff may recover civil penalties as an individual and on behalf of the State of California and the covered employees, up to the maximum amount allowed as set forth under the Labor Code.

Unpaid Meal Period Premium Wages
Violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, 1198; IWC Wage Orders

Defendants violated Labor Code sections 226.7, 512, and 1198, along with the related sections of the IWC Wage Orders with respect to the covered employees.

Labor Code section 512 and the IWC Wage Orders require that employers provide an uninterrupted 30-minute meal period after no more than five hours of work and a second meal period after no more than 10 hours of work. *See Brinker Restaurant Corp. v. Superior Court* (2012) 53 Cal.4th 1004, 1049. Labor Code section 226.7 requires that if a meal period is late, missed, short, or interrupted, the employer must pay one additional hour of pay at the employee’s “regular rate” of compensation. *Ferra v. Loews Hollywood Hotel, LLC* (2021) 11 Cal.5th 858, 862 (“We hold that the terms are synonymous: “regular rate of compensation” under section 226.7(c), like “regular rate of pay” under section 510(a), encompasses all nondiscretionary payments, not just hourly wages”). “[T]ime records showing noncompliant meal periods raise a rebuttable presumption of meal period violations, including at the summary judgment stage.” *Donohue v. AMN Services, LLC* (2021) 11 Cal.5th 58, 61. Labor Code section 1198 renders “employment of any employee for longer hours than those fixed by the order or under conditions of labor prohibited by the [IWC Wage Orders]” unlawful. The IWC Wage Orders, including Section 11 (Meal Periods), further require one uninterrupted 30-minute meal period after no more than five hours of work and a second meal period after no more than 10 hours of work and an additional hour of pay at the employee’s regular rate of compensation for each workday that a compliant meal period is not provided. Pursuant to Section 11(A) of the IWC Wage Orders, the California Supreme Court has held that the on-duty meal period exception is “exceedingly narrow” and applies only when (1) “the nature of the work prevents the employee from being relieved of all duty” and (2) *both* “the employer and employee have agreed, in writing, to the on-duty meal period.” *Augustus v. AMB Security Services, Inc.* (2016) 2 Cal.5th 257, 266-276 (emphasis added). If these two requirements are not met, then the employer owes the employee one hour of

premium pay for each non-compliant meal period taken under the purported on-duty meal arrangement. *Naranjo v. Spectrum Security Services, Inc.* (2019) 40 Cal.5th 444, 459.

Defendants implemented a policy and/or practice of assigning heavy workloads to Plaintiff and the covered employees, which at times resulted in late meal periods. On occasions when Plaintiff's workload was especially heavy, Plaintiff was unable to begin her meal period until after the fifth hour of work in order to attend to work-related demands. This occurred as a direct result of Defendants' workload practices, which did not account for the volume of work assigned to Plaintiff and the covered employees. As a result, Plaintiff and the covered employees were, on occasion, denied compliant meal periods.

Every time Plaintiff and the covered employees did not receive a compliant meal period, they were owed a meal period premium at their regular rate of compensation. However, during Plaintiff's employment with Defendants, Plaintiff never received a meal period premium. Plaintiff alleges, based on information and belief, that this was a matter of common policy and practice with respect to other covered employees.

As a result, Plaintiff may recover civil penalties as an individual and on behalf of the State of California and the covered employees, up to the maximum amount allowed as set forth under the Labor Code.

Untimely Payment of Wages During Employment **Violation of Labor Code §§ 204, 204b, 210**

Defendants violated Labor Code sections 204 and/or 204b and 210, as applicable, with respect to Plaintiff and the covered employees.

Labor Code section 204(a) requires payment of "all wages" for non-exempt employees at least twice each calendar month. Labor Code section 204(d) states all wages due must be paid "not more than seven calendar days following the close of the payroll period." Labor Code section 204b applies to employees paid on a weekly basis and also requires the payment for all labor within the required pay periods. Labor Code section 210 provides "every person who fails to pay the wages of an employee as provided in Section ... 204 ... shall be subject to a civil penalty" of \$100 for an initial violation and \$200 plus 25% of the amount unlawfully withheld for a subsequent violation.

Because Defendants failed to pay all wages and premiums in each pay period in which such wages were earned at the lawful rate, Defendants violated Labor Code section 204 and/or 204b (for weekly employees, as applicable). Defendants violated Labor Code sections 204 and 204b by failing to pay all wages and premiums owed on the regular pay days scheduled each pay period within seven calendar days of the close of the payroll period, as a result of the policies and practices set forth in this notice.

As a result, Plaintiff may recover civil penalties as an individual and on behalf of the State of California and the covered employees, up to the maximum amount allowed as set forth under the Labor Code.

Non-Compliant Wage Statements
Violation of Labor Code §§ 226, 226.3

Defendants violated Labor Code sections 226(a) and 226.3 with respect to the covered employees by failing to furnish itemized wage statements each pay period that accurately list all information required by Labor Code section 226(a)(1) through (9).

Labor Code section 226(a) requires an employer to furnish wage statements to employees semimonthly or at the time of each payment of wages, “an accurate itemized statement in writing showing:” (1) gross wages earned, (2) total hours worked, (3) the number of piece rate units earned and applicable piece-rate in effect, (4) all deductions, (5) net wages earned, (6) the inclusive dates of the pay period, (7) the name of the employee and last four digits of SSN or an EIN, (8) the name and address of the legal name of the employer, and (9) all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee.

Defendants failed to provide accurate itemized wage statements to the covered employees each pay period as a result of the policies and practices set forth in this notice. Defendants violated Labor Code section 226(a)(1) and (5) by not listing the correct “gross wages earned” or “net wages earned,” as the employees earned wages and premiums that were not paid, resulting in an inaccurate reflection, and recording of “gross wages earned” on those wage statements. Likewise, in violation of Labor Code section 226(a)(9), Defendants failed to state on employee wage statements each pay period the applicable hourly rates in effect and the number of hours worked at that rate, as Defendants failed to pay all wages and premiums owed to employees. The amounts stated are instead depreciated and underpaid, resulting in an inaccurate reflection on the pay stub.

Additionally, Defendants violated Labor Code section 226(a)(9) by failing to accurately list all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each rate. Specifically, when Plaintiff and the covered employees earned a shift differential for working afternoon shifts, Defendants’ itemized wage statements merely displayed a lump-sum dollar amount for the differential, failing to state the applicable hourly rate or the total number of hours worked subject to that differential.

Plaintiff and other covered employees cannot promptly and easily determine from the wage statement alone the wages paid or earned without reference to other documents or information. Indeed, these wage statement violations are significant because they sow confusion among Plaintiff and other covered employees with respect to what amounts were owed and paid, at what rates, the number of hours worked, and how those amounts were or

should be calculated. The wage statements reflect a false statement of earnings and concealed the underlying problems and underpayments of employee wages.

As a result, Plaintiff may recover civil penalties as an individual and on behalf of the State of California and the covered employees, up to the maximum amount allowed as set forth under the Labor Code.

Failure to Maintain Accurate Records
Violation of Labor Code § 1174; IWC Wage Orders

Defendants violated Labor Code sections 1174 and the IWC Wage Orders by failing to maintain accurate employee payroll records with respect to Plaintiff and other covered employees.

Labor Code section 1174 requires that employers maintain accurate “payroll records showing the hours worked daily by and the wages paid to, and the number of piece-rate units earned by and any applicable piece rate paid to, employees employed at the respective plants or establishments.” Section 7(A) of the IWC Wage Orders, which may be enforced through Labor Code section 1198, mandates similar recordkeeping obligations.

Because of the policies and practices set forth in this notice, including the failure to accurately account for wages earned or hours worked, Defendants failed to accurately maintain records in accordance with Labor Code section 1174 and the IWC Wage Orders.

As a result, Plaintiff may recover civil penalties as an individual and on behalf of the State of California and the covered employees, up to the maximum amount allowed as set forth under the Labor Code.

Attorneys’ Fees and Costs
Labor Code § 2699(k)(1)

Plaintiff has been compelled to retain the services of counsel to protect the interests of other covered employees and the State of California. Plaintiff continues to incur attorneys’ fees and costs, which are recoverable under California law, including Labor Code section 2699(k)(1).

- LITIGATION HOLD NOTICE -

This letter imposes a duty upon all defendants and their respective employees, officers, directors, executives, attorneys, human resource and payroll personnel, accountants, and other agents to preserve all physical and electronic evidence, including electronically stored information and emails, which relate to the employment of Plaintiff and the covered employees specified in this notice. Evidence includes, but is not limited to, Defendants’ written employment and payroll policies and handbooks; the covered employees’ personnel

files and payroll records, such as paystubs, time records, wage statements, compensation reports, as well as the underlying electronic data in Excel or similar format. Memoranda and internal and external correspondence relating to the subject matter of this notice shall also be maintained. Failure to preserve and retain relevant evidence may constitute spoliation of evidence and result in an adverse inference or sanctions.

If you have any questions regarding the scope of your obligations to preserve evidence, please consult your legal counsel and always err on the side of caution. Periodic or regularly scheduled purges or deletions of information covered by this hold must be suspended immediately.

- CONCLUSION -

If the LWDA does not pursue enforcement, Plaintiff intends to bring representative claims on behalf of the State of California and the covered employees seeking civil penalties for violations of the Labor Code and the IWC Wage Orders, along with attorneys' fees, costs, interest, and other appropriate relief.

Please advise if the LWDA intends to investigate any of the factual or legal allegations set forth in this notice. Defendants may contact Plaintiff's counsel with any questions regarding this letter or the forthcoming lawsuit.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Ninel Kocharyan". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Ninel Kocharyan

AR

Cc Plaintiff Rowena Claro
Kristen N Pagano, Chief Human Resources Officer, kpagano@resonetics.com